



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,216	01/02/2004	Philip S. Siegel	067439.0157	1168
5073	7590	10/23/2008		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.	EXAMINER			
2001 ROSS AVENUE	SHAAWAT, MUSSA A			
SUITE 600				
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980	ART UNIT			
	3627			
	NOTIFICATION DATE			
	10/23/2008			
	DELIVERY MODE			
	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/751,216	Applicant(s) SIEGEL, PHILIP S.
	Examiner MUSSA A. SHAAWAT	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 10-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10-16 and 29-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/9/08, 5/29/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to communications filed on 09/07/2007. Claims 1, 5, 10, 29 and 31-32 have been amended. Claims 6 and 9 have been previously cancelled. Claims 17-28 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-16 and 29-32 are pending examination.
2. IDS submitted on 07/09/2008 and 05/29/2008 has been considered.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-16 and 29-32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 and 35-46 of copending Application No. 09/817,353 referred to hereinafter as '353. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. '353 teaches all the limitations of claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-16 and 29-32 of the present application except for generating data for printing a return label for a particular merchandise. '353 teaches initiating a return process in response to receiving the electronic selection which may include generating data for printing a return label, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit generating data for printing a return label from '353.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10-16 and 29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams et al., US PG. Pub. No. (2002/0032612) referred to hereinafter as Williams.

Claim 1: Williams discloses a method of using the Internet to provide return labels to customers for facilitating returns of merchandise, comprising the steps of: receiving, from a customer, an electronic request via a web access tool associated with the customer, the electronic request to initiate return processing of merchandise having been purchased by the customer in a prior purchase transaction (see at least claim 22 Abstract);

In response to receiving the electronic request from the customer, accessing a database to obtain transaction information associated with customer, the transaction information identifying at least one item of merchandise having been purchased by the customer in a prior purchase transaction, (Claim 22 and Abstract);

displaying, to the customer via the web access tool, the transaction information comprising a list of the at least one item of merchandise having been purchased by the customer in the prior purchase transaction (see at least Para 0243-0244);

receiving an electronic selection, from the customer, via the web access tool, the electronic selection identifying a particular item of merchandise included in the list of at least one item of merchandise having been purchased by the customer in the prior

purchase transaction, the electronic transaction selection comprising a click on the particular item of merchandise in the list displayed to the customer and identifying the particular item of merchandise for returns processing (see at least Para 0243-0244);

in response to receiving the electronic selection comprising the click on the particular item of merchandise in the list of merchandise~ initiating a returns process for the particular item of merchandise selected by the consumer from the list of merchandise purchased by the consumer in a prior purchase transaction, the returns process initiated by a returns server (see at least Para 0243-0244); and

In response to receiving the electronic selection from the customer of the particular item of merchandise having been purchased by the customer in the prior purchase transaction, generating data for printing a return label for the particular item of merchandise selected by the customer, (see at least 0243-0244)

Claim 2: Williams teaches wherein the displaying step is performed by displaying a return information web page (see at least claim 22 Abstract).

Claim 7/8: Williams teaches a method comprising the step of accessing a database to obtain merchant return rules, and displaying at least one of the merchant return rules, (see at least Para 0017).

Claim 10: Williams teaches determining whether the return is valid (see at least Para 0173)

Claim 11: Williams teaches notifying the customer of an invalid return (see at least Para 0173).

Claim 12: Williams teaches determine whether the return is valid is performed by accessing one or more return rules associated with the merchant (see at least Para 0173)

Claim 13: Williams teaches the step of notifying a merchant of the return item, (see at least Para 0173-0176).

Claim 14: Williams teaches notifying a merchant of information about customer (see at least Para 0173-0176 and 0693)

Claim 15: Williams disclose downloading the data for printing a return label to the web access tool, (see at least Para 0412).

Claim 16: Williams teaches delivering data about the return to a customer account record (see at least Para 0533).

Claim 29: Williams teaches accessing a database to obtain customer information about the customer; and wherein the displaying step includes displaying at least part of the customer information; wherein the customer information comprises customer-specific credit information or customer-specific shipping information (see at least Para 0026, and 0063).

Claim 30: Williams teaches updating a customer profile associated with customer (see at least Para 0533, 0402, 0645).

Claim 31: Arganbright teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising sending a notification to a merchant associated with a particular item of merchandise of the

pending return, the notification identifying the customer and the particular item of merchandise (see at least Abstract).

Claim 32: the limitations of claim 32 are similar to the limitations of claims 1, and 30-31, therefore claim 32 is rejected based on the same rationale.

As per claims 5, the limitations of claims 5 are similar to the limitations of claim 1, therefore they are rejected based on the same rationale.

6. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of official notice.

Claims 3, and 4 official notice is taken regarding the old and notorious practice of generating a confirmation of a transaction on a separate page. See e.g., US6497408 par. 64. This official notice is hereby made final.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form 892 for cited references.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA A. SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mussa A Shaawat/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
October 15, 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627